

**From:** Curt Sahakian  
**To:** Microsoft ATR,attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inet...  
**Date:** 1/23/02 12:58pm  
**Subject:** the proposed Microsoft Settlement Rewards Microsoft instead of punishes it.

Gentlemen,

Please see the attached article that explains how the proposed Microsoft Settlement Rewards Microsoft instead of punishes it.

You have been snookered. Shame on you if you understand this. Shame on you if you don't.

Curt Sahakian

At 1/23/02 12:15 PM, OpenSource@bdcimail.com wrote:

>=====

>RUSSELL PAVLICEK: "The Open Source" InfoWorld.com

>=====

>

>Wednesday, January 23, 2002

>

>

>-----

>

>

>REWARDING PUNISHMENT

>

>Posted January 18, 2002 01:01 PM Pacific Time

>

>

>I'VE RECEIVED A number of requests to address the

>pending (as of this writing) settlement of the civil

>anti-trust lawsuit against Microsoft. Under the

>pending agreement, Microsoft will be obligated to

>provide hardware and software to thousands of

>underfunded school districts across the country. The

>logic, if you can call it that, is that such schools

>could benefit greatly from receiving the technology

>they lack.

>

>Undeniably, there is an emotionally compelling case for

>this. A gigantic company, found guilty of doing wrong,

>is ordered to help the underprivileged. "We need to do

>it for the children," cry the politicians. "Think of the

>children!"

>

>"For the children." That's the phrase politicians in

>Washington use to justify an action so irrational that  
>it cannot be justified any other way.  
>  
>How can I properly characterize this solution? It is  
>like a court ordering a convicted drug dealer to give  
>out more free samples of heroin to underprivileged  
>children to ensure that their poverty does not deprive  
>them of the opportunity to become addicted.  
>  
>Sure, public classrooms need more technology. And it is  
>especially important that children who don't have as  
>many opportunities in life get assistance. But that is  
>not adequate justification for assigning the fox to  
>guard the hen house.  
>  
>Personally, I like the counterproposal put forward by  
>Red Hat: Let Microsoft donate money for computing  
>resources for underfunded schools, but let those  
>donations go toward hardware only; then populate those  
>machines with open-source software.  
>  
>Why open source? Consider the future: What will the  
>schools do when they need to upgrade? If you give  
>schools Microsoft software, they will be caught in the  
>endless upgrade cycle that has characterized life in  
>the Microsoft world. Those upgrades will cost money,  
>money that these targeted school districts, by  
>definition, cannot spare.  
>  
>Instead, arming schools with open-source software will  
>have two benefits. First, it will set schools down a  
>long-term path that they can afford. The cost of  
>obtaining open-source upgrades is trivial. Without  
>low-cost software upgrades, all those nice shiny  
>computers run the risk of becoming boat anchors in  
>short order. I'm sure someone is saying, "But open  
>source is too difficult to administer!" Such does not  
>have to be the case, but I'll deal with that issue in  
>a future column.  
>  
>Also, the Red Hat proposal does not reward Microsoft in  
>the long term. If a company is convicted of  
>overpowering markets, why would you reward them by  
>putting one of the few markets they don't lead under  
>their control? This sounds a lot like a seed-unit  
>program for education, not the penalty imposed from  
>losing a trial.  
>  
>Corporate misdeeds are supposed to earn punishment, not

>long-term investment opportunities. I believe we would  
>all be better off if the courts acknowledged the  
>difference between the two.  
>  
>Would our schools be better off with open source? Let  
>me know at pavlicek@linuxprofessionalsolutions.com, or  
>sign on to my forum at InfoWorld.com.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>-----  
>THE LATEST IN LINUX FROM INFOWORLD:  
>  
>\* AOL quashes Red Hat purchase rumors  
>-----  
><http://www.infoworld.com/articles/hn/xml/02/01/22/020122hnaolquash.xml?0123weli>  
>  
>\* AOL reportedly eyeing Red Hat purchase  
>-----  
><http://www.infoworld.com/articles/hn/xml/02/01/21/020121hnaolredhat2.xml?0123weli>  
>  
>\* Report: AOL in talks to acquire Red Hat  
>-----  
><http://www.infoworld.com/articles/hn/xml/02/01/21/020121hnaolredhat.xml?0123weli>  
>  
>\* CES - Royal touts low-cost Linux PDA  
>-----  
><http://www.infoworld.com/articles/hn/xml/02/01/11/020111hnroyal.xml?0123weli>  
>  
>  
>To join, or start, a discussion on this or any IT-related  
>topic, please visit our InfoWorld forums at  
><http://forums.infoworld.com>. Here you can interact and  
>exchange ideas with InfoWorld staff and other readers.  
>-----  
>QUOTE OF THE DAY:  
>  
>"One of the greatest challenges for CTOs is where to  
>draw the line between insourcing and outsourcing -- you  
>can't get the job done by completely going either way."  
>  
>--InfoWorld CTO Chad Dickerson.  
>  
><http://www.infoworld.com/articles/op/xml/02/01/21/020121opconnection.xml?0123weli>  
>  
>-----  
>  
>SUBSCRIBE

>To subscribe to any of InfoWorld's e-mail newsletters,  
>tell your friends and colleagues to go to:  
><http://www.iwssubscribe.com/newsletters/>  
>  
>To subscribe to InfoWorld.com, or InfoWorld Print,  
>or both, go to <http://www.iwssubscribe.com>  
>  
>UNSUBSCRIBE  
>If you want to unsubscribe from InfoWorld's Newsletters,  
>go to <http://iwssubscribe.com/newsletters/unsubscribe/>  
>  
>CHANGE E-MAIL  
>If you want to change the e-mail address where  
>you are receiving InfoWorld newsletters, go to  
><http://iwssubscribe.com/newsletters/adchange/>  
>  
>-----  
>  
>Not the "Same Old, Same Old"  
>Not when it's e-business news, and not when it's from  
>InfoWorld. Our motto is "Lead with Knowledge," and  
>that's just what we do - and what our free daily E-Business  
>newsletter enables YOU to do. With hot e-business product  
>news, technology sightings, people and company profiles, and  
>commentary and analysis. All fresh daily in your inbox.  
>Go to <http://www.iwssubscribe.com/newsletters/>  
>  
>  
>-----  
>  
>Copyright 2002 InfoWorld Media Group Inc.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>This message was sent to: [cpart@interaccess.com](mailto:cpart@interaccess.com)

The Corporate Partnering Institute  
<http://PartneringAgreements.com>  
<http://Corporate-Partnering.com/cpi>  
(847) 676-9792 - (800) 948-1700

CC: [@Bellevue.com](mailto:OpenSourceHelp@Bellevue.com), [OpenSource@bdc...](mailto:OpenSource@bdc...)